



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,934	11/01/2001	Gopal B. Avinash	120768	3510
27256	7590	09/30/2005	EXAMINER	
ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C. 28333 TELEGRAPH RD. SUITE 250 SOUTHFIELD, MI 48034			PATEL, SHEFALI D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2621	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/682,934

Applicant(s)

AVINASH, GOPAL B.

Examiner

Shefali D. Patel

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-12 and 14-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-12 and 14-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment was received on July 19, 2005.
2. Claims 4 and 13 have been cancelled.
3. Claims 1-3, 5-12 and 14-20 are pending in this application.
4. With further consideration (due to the amendment), the indication for allow matter with regard to claims 5 and 14 have been re-considered and withdrawn.

The amendment to independent claims 1, 10 and 18 adds the limitations from claims 4 and 13. This changes the scope of the claims as a whole, because the claims that depend from claims 1, 10 and 18 are now incorporating additional limitations which were not previously considered. This also broadens the scope of claims 5 and 14 (because limitations has been omitted) and claims 5 and 14 were re-considered. Thus, this office action is made final as stated below.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10 and 18 (Remarks on pages 9-10) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-2, 5, 7, 9-11, 14, 16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruijns et al. (hereinafter, "Bruijns") (US 5,974,113) in view of Bolorforosh et al. (hereinafter, "Bolorforosh") (US 6,132,377).

With regard to **claim 1** Bruijns discloses a method of contrast matching a first image and a second image (col. 6 lines 35-47) comprising: generating an image ratio of the first image (S1) and the second image (S2) (obtaining ratio by using quotient unit 17 at col. 6 lines 64-67), *said ratio having a numerator and a denominator*; filtering the *regularized* image ratio to form a filtered ratio (using filter 19 at col. 7 lines 9-17); and multiplying the second image by the filtered ratio to form an adjusted image (multiplying image S2 by the quotient at col. 7 lines 15-23). Bruijns does not expressly disclose ratio having a numerator and a denominator; regularizing the image ratio by adding a constant to the denominator to form a regularized ratio. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that by definition ratio has a numerator and a denominator. Nonetheless, Bolorforosh discloses ratio by adding a constant to the denominator to form a regularized ratio at col. 6 lines 53-61. Note, Bolorforosh discloses fundamental receive signal (first image) and harmonic receive signal (second image) at col. 3 lines 19-66, col. 4 lines 17-26 and col. 6 lines 42-52. This ratio is computed for these two signals which would be the same as the two images in Bruijns. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Bolorforosh with Bruijns. The motivation for doing so is to have the ratio for using to modulate the image signal to enhance the display of contrast agent as disclosed at col. 2 lines 29-40 in Bolorforosh. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bolorforosh with Bruijns to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

With regard to **claim 2** Bruijns discloses a low pass filter 19 at col. 7 lines 9-17.

With regard to **claim 5** as disclosed in claim 1 above, Bruijns in view of Bolorforosh discloses regularizing that comprises multiplying the numerator by the second image and the denominator by the second image and adding the constant to the denominator.

With regard to **claim 7** Bruijns discloses multiplying the second image by the filtered ratio to form the adjusted image where the adjusted image is brightness matched to the first image (col. 7 lines 27-30 and col. 8 lines 46-53).

Art Unit: 2621

With regard to **claim 9** Bruijns discloses prior to filtering, regularizing an image ratio of the second image with respect to the first image to form a regularized image ratio (col. 6 lines 52 to col. 7 lines 1-9).

Claim 10 recites identical features as claim 1 except claim 10 is a method claim of operating a digital image device. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 1 is equally applicable to claim 10. Applicant's attention is invited to Figures 2 and 3 of Bruijns. Bruijns discloses generating first (S1) and second (S2) digital image (col. 6 lines 15-17, Figure 1) and matching the second image to the first image (see, col. 6 lines 46-51).

Claim 11 recites identical features as claim 2. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 2 is equally applicable to claim 11.

Claim 14 recites identical features as claim 5. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 5 is equally applicable to claim 14.

Claim 16 recites identical features as claim 7. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 7 is equally applicable to claim 16.

Claim 18 recites identical features as claim 1 except claim 18 is a system claim. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 1 is equally applicable to claim 18. Applicant's attention is invited to Figures 2 and 3 of Bruijns. Bruijns discloses a control unit 14 and a memory unit 41 in the system 40.

With regard to **claim 19** Bruijns discloses a display 35 as seen in Figure 1, which is connected to a controller 14 included in element 40.

With regard to **claim 20** Bruijns discloses a storage medium 41 as seen in Figure 2 and col. 7 lines 42-55.

8. Claims 3, 6, 8, 12, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruijns et al. (hereinafter, "Bruijns") (US 5,974,113) in view of Bolorforosh et al. (hereinafter, "Bolorforosh") (US 6,132,377) as applied to claims 1-2, 5, 7, 9-11, 14, 16, and 18-20 above, and further in view of Poland (US 6,080,107).

With regard to **claim 3** Bruijns (modified by Bolorforosh) discloses a low pass filter as disclosed above in claims 1-2 and the arguments are not repeated herein, but are incorporated by reference. Bruijns does not expressly disclose a boxcar filter. Poland discloses a boxcar filter at element 90 in Fig. 1 and at col. 13 lines 37-46. Bruijns, Bolorforosh and Poland are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, i.e., image processing in medical imaging. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Poland with Bruijns and Bolorforosh. The motivation for doing so is to reduce noise content and improve its accuracy. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Poland with Bruijns and Bolorforosh to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

With regard to **claim 6** Bruijns discloses the adjusted image is brightness matched to the first image as disclosed above in claim 7 and the arguments are not repeated herein, but are incorporated by reference. Bruijns does not expressly disclose the adjusted image is contrast matched to the first image. Poland discloses this at col. 11 lines 58-65 and col. 12 lines 21-34. Bruijns, Bolorforosh and Poland are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, i.e., image processing in medical imaging. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Poland with Bruijns and Bolorforosh. The motivation for doing so is to eliminate the radiation hazard and to determine the difference between the two images by analyzing contrast. Therefore, it would have

Art Unit: 2621

been obvious to combine Poland with Bruijns and Bolorforosh to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Claim 8 recites identical features as claims 6-7. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claims 6-7 is equally applicable to claim 8.

Claim 12 recites identical features as claim 3. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 3 is equally applicable to claim 12.

Claim 15 recites identical features as claim 6. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 6 is equally applicable to claim 15.

Claim 17 recites identical features as claim 8. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 8 is equally applicable to claim 17.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shefali D. Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-7396. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am - 5:00pm (First Friday Off).


Art Unit: 2621

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Mancuso can be reached on (571) 272-7695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shefali D Patel
Examiner
Art Unit 2621

September 23, 2005



MARY EXAM